

Pickering's record as a district judge stem from the gross distortion of that record by the liberal special interest groups. For example, one often-cited area of concern is Judge Pickering's record on Voting Rights Act cases, but the bottom line is that Judge Pickering has decided a total of three of those cases on the merits: Fairley, Bryant, and Morgan. None of these cases was appealed, a step that one can reasonably expect a party to take if it is dissatisfied with the court's ruling.

Moreover, the plaintiffs in the Fairley case, including Ken Fairley, former head of the Forrester County NAACP, have written letters in support of Judge Pickering's nomination. Judge Pickering's qualifications are also reflected in his ABA rating, which some members of the committee have referred to as the "gold standard" in evaluating judicial nominees. The ABA, of course, rated Judge Pickering well qualified for the Fifth Circuit.

I also find it ironic that many of the complaints Judge Pickering's opponents have lodged against him pertain to events that occurred before he became a Federal district court judge, a position for which he was unanimously confirmed by both this committee and the full Senate.

The way liberal special interest groups are working and have worked to change the ground rules on judicial confirmations is evident in the nomination of Charles Pickering for the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. This is a gentleman who had overwhelming support in his home State of Mississippi from Democrats and Republicans alike, from the Democrat attorney general of the State, and from prominent members of the African-American community.

Those who know Judge Pickering well know he has worked to improve race relations in Mississippi. For example, he testified against the Imperial Wizard of the KKK for firebombing a civil rights activist in Mississippi in 1967, at great risk to both himself and his family. He hired the first African-American Republican political worker in Mississippi in 1976; represented a black man falsely accused of robbing a 16-year-old white girl in 1981 and won the case for him; chaired a race relations committee for Jones County, Mississippi, in 1988; served on the board of the Institute of Racial Reconciliation at the University of Mississippi since 1999; and worked with at-risk African-American youth in Laurel, Mississippi, in 2000.

I have to say I was pleased that my colleagues on the other side said they do not believe he is a racist and they do not believe that such a case can be made, and they were disappointed that some tried to make it.

I say, in addition, Judge Pickering has compiled an impressive record as a Federal district court judge. During his more than 11 years on the bench, he has disposed of an estimated 4,000 to 4,500 cases, but he has been reversed

only 26 times. This means his reversal rate is roughly one-half of 1 percentage point and is lower than the average reversal rate for Federal district court judges in this country.

Despite this impressive career, Judge Pickering had become the target of a smear campaign instigated and perpetrated by liberal Washington interest groups and lobbyists with their own political agenda, some of whom called him, in essence, a racist. These groups painted a caricature of a man that bears little resemblance to reality, all in the name of attempting to change the ground rules for the judicial confirmation process and impose their political litmus test for all of President Bush's judicial nominees.

We are now seeing the same thing starting with another circuit court of appeals nominee, D. Brooks Smith, with the same type of approaches they have used against Judge Pickering.

We had a number of Senators say they voted against Judge Pickering because of his 26 reversals, some of which they considered questionable in the areas of voting rights, in the area of civil rights, in the area of prisoners' rights, and in the area of employment rights. We blew those arguments away today because we cited nearly every case about which they are complaining. They claim Judge Pickering did not follow settled law, and we showed that there was not settled law in many of those cases.

We did not hear those cases really argued today from the principal people who argued them before. They could not. So what did we hear an argument on? The Swan case. Now what was the Swan case? The Swan case the case of a cross burning on the lawn of an African-American family.

I might mention that is a vicious, rotten, lousy thing for anybody to do.

Of the three boys who did it, one of them was a vicious racist who had shot into the house with a gun. Because two of them cooperated, the Justice Department prosecutors gave them basically a giveaway, easy sentence. The third was absolutely drunk at the time. He had not shot into the home, he had not issued any racist comments, but he was with them. He did not think he did anything wrong. He contested the case, lost, and under the mandatory minimum he had to be sentenced to 7 years.

The judge did not think that was right, that the other two really were as or more culpable, and when he looked and found out that this young man had never made a racist comment and he was drunk at the time, he thought it was a tremendous injustice. So what he did was he complained to one of his friends, Frank Hunger, who was with the Justice Department at the time, but not at the Civil Rights Division at the Civil Division. Swan still got a sentence of 27 months, a fairly long time when his two co-defendants got only home confinement and probation.

Because he talked to Frank Hunger, who was with the Civil Division, not

the Civil Rights Division, we had efforts to paint that as a tremendous violation of ethics. Hardly. Hunger does not even remember the conversation and is one of the strongest supporters of Judge Pickering, a Democrat from the Clinton Administration Justice Department. He is very disappointed with what happened to Judge Pickering's nomination.

There are other things I would like to say, but I know my colleague would like to speak. I will close with this: I am sorely disappointed with the vote on Judge Pickering's nomination. I am sorely disappointed with the way these outside groups tried to paint Mississippi as the old South, prejudiced, rotten, acting in ways that fly in the face of civil rights, when there have been so many strides made, part of them made because of the efforts of Judge Charles Pickering.

I do not understand this type of thing. In each case in which a nominee was stopped in Committee, I have wondered why they were stopped.

I do not live in Mississippi, but I feel for the people of Mississippi because this action today, it seems to me, is a condemnation of a State that does not deserve it, and a condemnation of a Federal judge who went through the Senate the first time unanimously, who has served well for nearly 12 solid years, and who now has a reputation besmirched because of what I consider to be phony allegations which should never have been accepted.

I am disappointed. But unfortunately, that is the way it is around here. I hope we do not have to put up with much more of this in the future.

I notice my colleagues want to speak, so I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Nevada.

**Mr. REID.** Madam President, it is my understanding the Senate is still on S. 517; is that right?

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator is correct.

**Mr. REID.** The Senator from Arizona is still present. It is my understanding he is not going to offer his amendment tonight. Is that right?

**Mr. KYL.** Yes.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

**Mr. REID.** Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period for morning business with Senators allowed to speak therein for a period not to exceed 10 minutes.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### NOMINATION OF CHARLES PICKERING

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Alabama.

**Mr. SESSIONS.** Madam President, one of our colleagues earlier, in talking about the Pickering nomination, talked about the difficulty of making judgments. Of course, that is what they